Flexible work arrangements, organizational culture and employee well-being

TIMMS, C. (James Cook University), BROUGH, P (Griffith University), KALLIATH, T (Australian National University) O'DRISCOLL, M (University of Waikato, NZ), SIU, O.L (Lingnan University, HK), SIT, C (University of Hong Kong, HK) & LO, D (Shue Yan University, HK)

carolyn.timms@jcu.edu.au

Abstract

Flexible work arrangements (FWAs) are often written into company policy to demonstrate that the organisation is sensitive to potentially difficult interfaces between employees' work and non-work domains. However the take up of such policies by employees depends on embedded workplace cultural norms. These norms can be supportive or they can hinder use of flexible options by employees. The current research investigated employees' use of FWAs and its particular relationship to work engagement within the context of their organisational culture. Turnover intentions and psychological strain were also used as criterion variables for comparison purposes. A heterogeneous sample of Australian employees (n = 823) responded to two waves of data collection with a twelve month interval. Relationships between supportive and hindering aspects of organisational culture and the outcome variables of work engagement, turnover intentions and psychological strain supported the research hypotheses in expected directions. However, the research also identified a negative relationship between use of FWAs and work engagement over time. This highlights the organisational climate in which FWAs are made available to employees. These results and implications are discussed.

Work-life balance refers to manageability of the different domains of one's life so that they complement rather than compete with each other (e.g., Brough, O'Driscoll, & Kalliath, 2005). Unsatisfactory resolution to tension generated by these competing priorities is referred to as *work-life conflict* (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000). Work-life conflict is associated with exhaustion and psychological strain and leads to deleterious health outcomes, absenteeism and turnover (Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler, & Wethington, 1989).

Abbott, De Cieri, and Iverson (1998) found that organisational costs of ignoring the personal commitments and responsibilities of employees included high absenteeism and turnover (see also, Brough, 2005). It follows that policies designed to enhance employees' autonomy and integration of their work and non-work lives will be beneficial to organisations (De Cieri, Holmes, Abbott, & Pettit, 2005). Carless and Wintle (2007) suggested that that the provision of flexible solutions such as flexible hours, career paths and telecommuting can make organisations more attractive to prospective employees (see also, Casper, Fox, Sitzmann, & Landy, 2004; Cook, 2009). Thus it is in the best interests of organisations to provide the means by which disparate responsibilities can be managed in order to attract and retain skilled personnel.

Flexible Work Arrangements

Flexible work arrangements (FWAs) are strategies provided by organisations by which employees can better balance demands from multiple domains (Allen, 2001; Brough, et al., 2005). Examples of FWAs include: *flexitime* (e.g., employees choose their start and finishing times of work), *compressed work week* (e.g., employees choose to work four long days instead of five regular days), *telecommuting* (e.g., employees work from home via information communication

technology [ICT]) and finally, *part-time* work. FWA provisions are also attractive to employees who do not have family responsibilities but who nevertheless desire flexibility between their work and non-work lives (Carless & Wintle, 2007; Hall, 1990).

Organisational Culture

Articulation of FWA policies in company documents is good for organisations in terms of reputation (as employee friendly workplaces) and attracting potential employees (Carless & Wintle, 2007). However, Dikkers, Geurts, den Dulk, Peper, and Kompier (2004) found that actual access or use of FWAs was influenced by the pre-existing *culture* of a workplace which (because it is usually psychological in nature and informal in implementation), may have little resemblance to official policy (Behson, 2005; Kirby & Krone, 2002). Once they are employed, workers acquire an insider's understanding of the difference between written policies and unwritten practices embedded in organisational mores (Denison, 1996). This can take the form of expectations that workers will put extra time into ensuring that work will be done (time expectations) or norms where workers get a clear message that prioritising personal needs will have negative consequences for their career progression. Such organisational cultures convey strong signals to employees that accessing FWAs may have repercussions in terms of their personal career, may create extra burdens (work) for their colleagues, and produce work-group resentment (McDonald, Pini, & Bradley, 2007).

McDonald et al. (2007) suggested that actual *reasons* for use of FWAs might moderate supervisory judgements of employee commitment. For example in McDonald's qualitative study some respondents who used FWAs for the purpose of accommodating tertiary study (rather than caring for children), confidently commented that their personal career options would not be affected because their

reasons did not include family responsibilities. Implicit within such a viewpoint is the widely accepted opinion that family commitments dilute employees' commitment to the organisation (e.g., Allen, 2001; Beauregard & Henry, 2009).

Work engagement

According to Salanova and Schaufeli (2008) the presence of work engagement among workers is an indicator of their intrinsic motivation. However, people's lives inevitably extend beyond their work. Sonnentag, Mojza, Binnewies, and Scholl (2008) observed that a key factor in employee engagement was the ability to '*switch off*' or *psychologically detach* from work during non-work time. Typically such psychological detachment involves people's social relationships and activities such as catching up with friends or pursuing hobbies or other interests. In addition, most employees have other responsibilities that must be attended to and for which they must be psychologically present, such as dependent children, family, household tasks, and sport. Sonnentag et al. found that people who were unable to achieve detachment from their work experienced a corresponding lowering of their work engagement. It is therefore observed that a long hours work culture described by a number of researchers (e.g., McDonald, et al., 2007; Timms, Lankshear, Anderson, & Courtney, 2008) could potentially erode employees' engagement with work.

Researchers have previously found that job satisfaction is a good predictor of employees' intentions to stay and it is also associated with low rates of absenteeism (Allen, 2001; Brough, et al., 2005). However job satisfaction alone does not sufficiently capture the positive energy that is found in workplaces where workers are thriving (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). A common theme has emerged within

organisational research that workers who are engaged in their work will not seek alternative employment (e.g., Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Schaufeli, 2004).

According to the Job Demands Resources theory (JD-R, Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), resources within the work environment provide a counterbalance to work demands and employee mental health. The theoretical linkage between FWAs and work engagement therefore lies in the discretion afforded to employees as to how work is done (Behson, 2005) and how workers can achieve some mechanisms of control and autonomy. Also within JD-R theory periphery are the resources that provide the means for employees to utilise FWAs, i.e. the supportive psycho-social work environment.

The Current Research

Following the lead of previous research involving FWAs (e.g., Allen, 2001; Brough, et al., 2005) we have included job satisfaction as an outcome variable. In addition the current study anticipates that the inclusion of a specific psychological health criterion variable (work engagement) will provide more accurate information concerning the impact of FWAs on psychological well-being.

Drawing on these previous findings and extrapolating them to include the complex relationships of work engagement, use of FWAs and organisational culture (supportive and hindering); the following hypotheses are advanced for this research:

H1. Respondents who report that their workplace culture is distinguished by time expectations and negative career consequences will be unlikely to use FWAs. They will demonstrate (a) lower work engagement, (b) higher turnover intentions and (c) higher psychological strain.

H2. Respondents who report that their workplace culture is supportive will be more likely to use FWAs. They will demonstrate (a) higher work

engagement, (b) lower turnover intentions and (c) lower psychological strain.

Method

Sample and Procedure

The sample consisted of employees from eight Australian organisations representing banking, education, public service and community service, who responded to two self-report surveys administered over a twelve month period. Response rates varied, ranging from 10% to 52% across the participating organisations, with an average response rate of 33%. Data were collected at two Australian sites. A total *N* = 823 (21.5%) workers were matched from the Time 1 and Time 2 survey responses.

Of the 823 matched respondents, the majority (72%) were female (*n* = 593). Respondents ranged in age from 20 to 70 years, with an average age of 43 years (SD =10.30). At Time 1, 351 (43%) respondents indicated that they were single (with no commitments to spouse and/or dependents) and 57% (*n* = 472) indicated they had family commitments. Forty three percent (*n* = 352) of respondents had a university or college degree and 70% of these (*n* = 248) had at least one post-graduate qualification. The majority of respondents indicated they were working in a full-time position (*n* = 613; 75%). The mean tenure reported by respondents was 11 years (SD = 9.53).

Measures

Organisational Culture: Eleven items from Dikkers et al.'s (2004) organisational culture measure were included. The measures consist of three subscales: *organisational support* (four-items) "In general, this company is considerate towards employees' private situation"; *negative career consequences*

(hindrance; three-items) “In this company, employees who [temporarily] reduce their working hours for private reasons are considered less ambitious” and *time expectations* (hindrance; four-items) “In order to be taken seriously in this company, employees should work long days and be available all the time”. Respondents reported how much they agreed with the statements on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 = ‘totally disagree’ to 5 = ‘totally agree’. High scores are therefore indicative of a supporting or hindering organisational culture. Each subscale demonstrated adequate internal reliability (Cronbach’s alphas): organisational support = .87 (Time 1) and .88 (Time 2); negative career consequences = .88 (Time 1) and .90 (Time 2), and time expectations = .86 (Time 1) and .88 (Time 2).

Supervisor Support: The four item supervisor support scale developed by O’Driscoll, Brough and Kalliath (2000) was included. The items ask *how often* respondents had received support in relation to work-related problems in the previous three months. Items referred to helpful information or advice (*informational support*), sympathetic understanding and concern (*emotional support*), clear and helpful feedback (*feedback support*) and practical assistance (*practical support*). Respondents answered on a 6-point frequency scale, where 1 = ‘never’ and 6 = ‘all the time’. High scores on the aggregate scale indicated high supervisor support. Internal consistencies (Cronbach’s alphas) for supervisor support were .94 (T1) and .95 (T2).

Turnover intention: (Brough & Frame, 2004) three-item turnover intentions measure was included. An example item is: “How often have you seriously considered leaving your current job in the past six months?” Respondents answered on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = ‘not at all’ to 5 =‘a great deal’. High

scores therefore indicate high turnover intentions. Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) for the current study were .82 (T1) and .84 (T2).

Flexible Work Arrangements: The four-item FWA sub-scale from Allen's (2001) 10-item measure of work-life organisational policies was used. The four items referred to *flexitime, compressed working week, telecommuting,* and *part-time work*. Respondents selected one of four responses for each item: (1) not offered but I don't need it; (2) not offered but I could use it; (3) offered but not used; and (4) offered and I use it. To derive a score for benefit availability, responses (1) and (2) were coded '0' and responses (3) and (4) were coded '1'. Total benefit *availability* was computed by summing availability scores for all four items. The score for *usage* was derived by scoring responses (1), (2), and (3) as '0' and response (4) as '1'. Total benefit *usage* was computed by summing usage scores across all four items. The categorical nature of FWA availability and usage scores makes the computation of reliability estimates irrelevant.

Work Engagement: Engagement was measured with the nine-item short version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). An example item is "I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose". Respondents answered on a seven-point Likert-type scale, from 0 ='never' and 6 = 'always'. High scores therefore indicate higher levels of work engagement. Internal consistency for the UWES was .91 (Time 1 and Time 2).

Anxiety/Depression: The four item Anxiety/Depression subscale (Kalliath, O'Driscoll, & Brough, 2004) from the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ, Goldberg, 1972) was utilized as a measure of psychological strain. The GHQ is a widely used measure of psychological strain that has consistently reported high levels of internal reliability in previous studies (e.g., Kalliath et al., 2004). Items from the GHQ were

prefaced with the stem “Have you recently experienced the following in the past few weeks…” and a sample item from the Anxiety/Depression subscale is “been feeling unhappy or depressed?” The Anxiety/Depression items were measured on a four-point frequency scale with 0 = “more so than usual” and 3 = “much less than usual”. In the current study anxiety/depression achieved a Cronbach’s alpha of .81 (Time 1) and .80 (Time 2).

Results

Descriptive data and correlations

Table 1 provides information in regard to reported availability and use of FWAs at Time 1 and Time 2. It is observed that while respondents’ *awareness* of the availability increased at Time 2, reported *usage* decreased over time. In regard to reported overall availability and use of FWAs reported in Table 1, these figures represent the creation of dummy variables where in regard to availability (0 = no FWAs available and 1= at least one FWA is available) and in regard to use (0= do not use FWAs and 1= use at least one FWA).

----------INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE----------

Table 2 provides descriptive information and mean score difference testing for the research variables at both Time 1 and Time 2. Mean scores were statistically tested by paired samples *t* tests with a Bonferroni adjustment probability level of .006 or *t* =3 .09 critical value. At Time 2 respondents reported significantly higher levels of work engagement than at Time 1, more awareness of availability of FWAs and yet reduced use of FWAs. These tests produced large effect sizes; all other cross-time differences were not statistically significant.

----------INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE----------

The results of bivariate correlations of the research variables are provided in Table 3. It is noted that most relationship directions are consistent with the study hypotheses. Negative relationships between hindering elements of organisational culture (time expectations and negative career consequences) and use of FWAs are consistent with our predictions (H1), however the relationships are small or non-significant. A surprising result is the negative relationship between use of FWAs and work engagement (H2). The use of FWAs at Time 1 has a positive relationship with work engagement (Time 1) and a negative relationship with work engagement at Time 2. Some explanations for this finding will be addressed in the discussion.

----------INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE----------

Both cross-sectional (T1) and longitudinal hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted. The longitudinal analyses tested the ability of the Time 1 predictor variables to estimate the Time 2 criterion variables. Gender, age and single/family status acted as controls in all regression equations. Summaries of these results are presented in Tables 4 and 5. The cross-sectional analyses (Time 1 variables, Table 4) indicated that turnover intentions were associated with being single, experiencing a 'long work hours' culture and a lack of supervisor support. Work engagement was associated with being single, experiencing a supportive supervisor and a supportive organisation. Anxiety/depression was associated with a lack of supervisor support and negative career consequences. The cross sectional regression analyses achieved $F(8, 784) = 24.90$, $p < .001$ for turnover intentions with the model explaining 19% of the variance, $F(8, 786) = 14.89$, $p < .001$ for work engagement with the model explaining 12% of the variance and $F(8, 782) = 11.53$, $p < .001$ for anxiety depression with the model explaining 10% of the variance.

----------INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE----------

Summaries of the longitudinal multiple regression analyses are presented in Table 5. In all cases the Time 1 criterion variables (step 1) were the strongest predictors of their Time 2 equivalents, with R^2 change observations revealing that minimal variance was contributed by the subsequent predictor variables. Similar to the cross-sectional analyses (Table 4), turnover intentions were associated with being single and experiencing a 'long work hours' culture. Work engagement at Time 2 was predicted by being married and/or having children. Most interestingly, *non*-use of FWAs at Time 1 was a significant predictor of work engagement at Time 2. The longitudinal regression analyses achieved $F(9, 779) = 39.91$, $p<.001$ for turnover intentions with the model explaining 31% of the variance, $F(9, 785) = 77.60$, $p<.001$ for work engagement with the model explaining 47% of the variance, and $F(9, 778) = 30.94$, $p<.001$ for anxiety depression with the model explaining 26% of the variance.

----------INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE----------

Discussion

This research assessed relationships between the type of organisational culture (support versus hindrance), employees' use of FWAs and their subsequent experiences of work engagement, turnover intentions and psychological strain. Findings in respect to hypotheses were mixed. Contrary to expectations, use of FWAs appeared to have minimal relationships with both turnover intentions and psychological strain. In addition, contrary to expectations (H2) the use of FWAs contributed to reduced work engagement over time. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, we found negative relationships between the use of FWAs and organisational hindrance. Predictions that employees' intentions to turnover would reflect lack of supervisor and organisational support was supported in the cross-sectional analysis

using T1 data, but were not supported over time (H1). In regard to turnover intentions, organisational time expectations were predictive in both the cross-sectional analysis (T1 data) and over time, whereas negative career consequences only demonstrated significance in the cross-sectional analysis (H1). Negative career consequences were similarly only predictive of anxiety/depression in the cross-sectional analysis but not over time.

The present study highlights the importance of a supportive organisational culture in attenuating employees' intentions to turnover and the development of psychological strain. It also serves to demonstrate that organisational expectations that employees will work long hours have a direct relationship with turnover intentions. The current findings support previous research suggesting that the presence of work engagement among workers is an important signal to management that the organisation is functioning well in terms of communication, support and meeting the expectations of employees (Saks, 2006; Schaufeli, 2004). Therefore it is observed that work engagement provides researchers with a measure of the success or otherwise of organisational attempts to combine policies and practise (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003).

FWAs and Organisational Culture.

Literature on the use of FWAs by employees suggests that these policies offer employees opportunities to balance their divergent needs in an autonomous manner (Behson, 2005). However the current study suggests that current employees may not consider that FWAs are real options. It is possible that this is due to informal processes within organisations that do not support their use (Kirby & Krone, 2002; Thompson et al., 2004) because of significant associations in the current research between use of FWAs, organisational support and negative career consequences. In

terms of the JD-R theoretical perspective (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) FWA provision could ostensibly be seen as an employee resource. On the other hand, it is suggested in the current research that without a supportive work environment, the presence of FWAs within organisational policy may well constitute an extra burden on employees. Kirby and Krone (2002) observed that formal and informal message pathways within organisations may compete with each other, leaving employees in the position where the choice to use FWAs (supposedly in place to assist them in balancing the domains of their life) affects their future career prospects and supervisory judgments on their commitment. This may have relevance for the current finding that work engagement was negatively associated with the use of FWAs.

This finding is inconsistent with previous literature advocating incorporation of FWAs in company policies. For example, Abbott et al. (1998) suggested that organisations should introduce family-friendly policies (including FWAs) in the interests of raising employee satisfaction and lowering turnover. Cook (2009) suggested that offering FWAs would be viewed by employees as a message of respect for their valued contribution. According to Laschinger and Finegan (2005), any message conveying respect for employees will be empowering and will build trust, thus contributing to work engagement. The current findings suggest that FWA provision within company policy has satisfied a requirement that the organisation be seen to be sensitive to the needs of employees. However it also suggests that the presence of FWAs within organisational policy may well constitute an incongruent message that increases burdens on employees. Therefore it is suggested that FWA provision without con-current supportive environments will not provide any of the positive outcomes suggested in previous research.

Organisational Culture, Use of Flexible Solutions and Work Engagement

Dikkers et al. (2004) found that high support (organisational and supervisor) occurred in tandem with high hindrance (time expectations and negative career consequences) and concluded that it was possible these two informal dimensions could co-exist within the experience of employees. Thus, organisations may recognise conflicting inter-domain demands on employees, and provide and encourage the use of flexible solutions to address employee problems. However, they also manage to convey a message of a company perception that those employees who do not work extra hours are not as seriously committed to their job and therefore could not be considered for promotion (e.g., Beauregard & Henry, 2009; Kirby & Krone, 2002). Inevitably this perception must be associated with cynical judgements in regard to organisational integrity and reliability on the part of employees. Our cross-sectional results support this conclusion in that hindrance and support were both significant predictors of turnover intentions. Furthermore, the finding that actual use of FWAs was also a predictor of turnover intentions and *non-use* predicted work engagement, suggests that respondents did not necessarily find using FWAs a congenial solution to their work-life interface issues.

Behson (2005) noted that informal mechanisms within organisations are far more influential in terms of employee outcomes than are formal mechanisms. In addition, previous research has observed that immediate supervisors are the most visible (Cook, 2009) and influential (McDonald et al., 2007) representatives of organisational policies. Casper et al. (2004) commented that supervisors are often poorly informed as to the beneficial nature of FWAs. It is therefore possible that respondents who chose *not* to use FWA solutions to their work-life interface problems have ascertained that their jobs were more secure if they chose not to use

flexible solutions to their work-life interface. Consequently individual employees might well be obliged to use FWAs as a 'trade-off' (to balance work and non-work interests) in full knowledge that this will be damaging to their future career prospects and possibly their job security. It follows that this would be deleterious to their engagement with their work.

Limitations

It is thought that the second phase of our research was influenced by the GFC which occurred in Australia in late 2008. According to a government report (Australian Government, 2009) more than 150,000 full-time jobs were lost during the GFC in Australia. During this time many Australian workers were confronted by fears for their job security (Rafferty, Schutz, & Yu, 2010). Therefore it is possible that the current finding of reduction in use of FWAs at Time 2 was influenced by the prevailing economic conditions and that further research may demonstrate alternate findings.

A second limitation of the current research lies in low response rates; this is a widely recognised problem of research involving self-report surveys, which according to Krosnick (1999) would not necessarily affect substantive conclusions. Finally, with the exception of turnover intentions, the current study reveals only a small (but significant) proportion of variance in work engagement and anxiety/depression is explained by workplace culture, supervisor support and use of FWAs, particularly in the time lagged analysis. This serves to highlight the synergistic nature of influences affecting the workplace environment and the difficulties faced by researchers in teasing out those that are most influential. In addition, as substantial proportions of turnover intentions, work engagement and anxiety/depression remain unexplained by the model, it is acknowledged that alternative variables must contribute to these

outcomes. However it is also advanced that some variables (such as time expectations in regard to turnover and non-use of FWAs in regard to work engagement) retained their individual influence after controlling for Time one equivalent variables, and are therefore identified as important contributors which cannot be disregarded (see, Rosenthal & DiMatteo, 2001).

Implications for Organisational Practise

The literature recommends that an organisational provision of FWAs will provide employees with an effective tool to manage their work-life balance with autonomy (De Ciero et al., 2005), thereby reducing employee absenteeism, turnover intentions and job satisfaction (Abbott et al., 1998; Allen, 2001; Brough et al., 2005). The current research, using work engagement as a criterion variable, found that this is not necessarily the case. What has been highlighted in the current research is the fact that formal and informal processes within organisations work together. An important implication is that anomalies between these two forms of communication must be addressed in order to achieve well functioning workplaces. Strategies provided by organisations for employees to gain autonomy in regard to their work-life balance must be combined with two-way communication that is sensitive to the perceptions of employees about the implications of using such policies. In addition, it is necessary for organisations to evaluate the effect of FWAs and educate supervisory personnel on the outcomes of such evaluations so that their tangible influence on employee outcomes is better informed.

Theoretical implications

The current research was conducted at a time where there was a downturn in economic conditions associated with widespread retrenchment (Rafferty et al., 2010). Using a JD-R perspective (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) in periods of difficult

employment the fact that one remains employed could be regarded as a resource that assumes a higher profile than psycho-social or other features of the work environment. However, an alternative explanation might be that in such times people are more aware of difficulties facing organisations. In addition, it is possible that organisations become more communicative in regard to conveying their strategies for negotiating altered circumstances with their employees (Rigby, 2003). Therefore it is possible that the sense of involvement thus afforded may provide employees with emotional and intellectual recognition that encourages best efforts and best thinking (Kim & Mauborgene, 1998), thereby contributing to organisational productivity and may well contribute to work engagement on many levels.

Conclusion

The current research found an inverse relationship between use of FWAs and work engagement. Non-use of FWAs was associated with work engagement. It is possible that the current findings reflect some (temporary) instability in job security as a consequence of the Global Financial Crisis. The observed reduction in use of FWAs may therefore represent a sense of reduced job security and consequently a perceived need to be more visible within the workplace to remind management personnel of employees' value. We also found that organisational hindrance had a positive and (in the case of time expectations) sustained relationships with employee turnover intentions. It is therefore apparent that both organisations and employees adjust their employment expectations in order to ensure organisational survival through tough economic times. Whether this has a long-term impact of employees use of FWA will be of interest to assess.

References

Abbott, J., De Cieri, H., & Iverson, R. (1998). Costing turnover: Implications of work/family conflict at the management level. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 36*, 25-43.

Allen, T. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*(3), 414-435.

Australian Government (2009). *Keep Australia Working*. Canberra: Australian Government Retrieved from http://www.keepaustraliaworking.gov.au/documents/PDFs_RTFs/KAW_report%20_29%20Oct__final.pdf.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*, 309-328.

Beauregard, A. T., & Henry, L. C. (2009). Making the link between work-life balance practices and organizational performance. *Human Resource Management Review, 19*, 9-22.

Behson, S. J. (2005). The relative contribution of formal and informal organizational work-family support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*, 487-500.

Bolger, N., DeLongis, A., Kessler, R., & Wethington, E. (1989). The contagion of stress across multiple roles. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 51*(1), 175-183.

Brough, P. (2005). Workplace violence experienced by paramedics: Relationships with social support, job satisfaction, and psychological strain. *Australasian Journal of Disaster and Trauma Studies* Retrieved December 05 2005, from http://www.massey.ac.nz/~trauma/issues/current.shtml

Brough, P., & Frame, R. (2004). Predicting police job satisfaction, work well-being and turnover intentions: The role of social support and police organisational variables. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 33*(1), 8-16.

Brough, P., O'Driscoll, M., & Kalliath, T. (2005). The ability of 'family friendly' organisational resources to predict work-family conflict and job and family satisfaction. *Stress and Health, 21*, 223-234.

Carless, S. A., & Wintle, J. (2007). Applicant attraction: The role of recruiter function, work-life balance policies and career salience. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 15*(4), 394-404.

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K., & Williams, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidemensional measure of work/family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56*(2), 249-276.

Casper, W. J., Fox, K. E., Sitzmann, T. M., & Landy, A. L. (2004). Supervisor referrals to work-family programs. *Journal of Occupational Health Psycholgy, 9*(2), 136-151.

Cook, A. (2009). Connecting work-family policies to supportive work environments. *Group & Organization Management, 34*(2), 206-240.

De Cieri, H., Holmes, B., Abbott, J., & Pettit, T. (2005). Achievements and challenges for work/life strategies in Australian organisations. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 6*(1), 90-103.

Dikkers, J., Geurts, S., Den Dulk, L. D., B, P., & Kompier, A. (2004). Relations among work-home culture, the utilisation of work-home arrangements, and work-home interference. *International Journal of Stress Management, 11*, 323-345.

Goldberg, D. (1972). The detection of psychiatric illness by questionnaire *Maudsley Monograph No 21*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hall, D. T. (1990). Promoting work/family balance: An organization-change approach. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*, 5-18.

Kalliath, T., O'Driscoll, M., & Brough, P. (2004). Confirmatory factor analysis of the General Health Questionnaire-12. *Stress and Health, 20*(1), 11-20.

Kirby, E. L., & Krone, K. J. (2002). "The policy exists but you can't really use it": Communication and the structuration of work-family policies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 30*(1), 50-77.

Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Survey research. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50*, 537-567.

Laschinger, H. K. S., & Finnegan, J. (2005). Using empowerment to build trust and respect in the workplace: A strategy for addressing the nursing shortage. *Nursing Economics, 23*(1), 6-13.

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 397-422.

McDonald, P., Pini, B., & Bradley, L. (2007). Freedom or fallout in local government? How work-life culture impacts employees using flexible work practices. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18*(4), 602-622.

O'Driscoll, M. (2000). Work and family transactions. In P. Koopman-Boyden, A. Dharmalingam, B. Grant, V. Hendy, S. Hillcoat-Nallétamby, D. Mitchell, M. O'Driscoll & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Transactions in The Mid-Life Family* (pp. 92-112). Hamilton: Population Association of New Zealand.

Rafferty, M., Schutz, H., & Yu, S. (2010). Staffing cutback in the South Australian public sector and their likely effects: Results of a survey of state public sector employees. Sydney: Faculty of Economics and Business, Sydney University.

Rigby, D. (2003). Management tools survey 2003: Usage up as companies strive to make headway in tough times. *Strategy and Leadership, 31*(5), 4-11.

Rosenthal, R., & DiMatteo, M. (2001). Meta-analysis. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 59-82.

Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. (2008). A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive behaviour. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19*(1), 116-131.

Schaufeli, W. B. (2004). The future of occupational health psychology. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53*, 502-517.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Preliminary Manual*. Utrecht: Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University.

Sonnentag, S., Mojza, E. J., Binnewies, C., & Scholl, A. (2008). Being engaged at work and detached at home. A week-level study on work engagement, psychological detachment and affect. *Work and Stress, 22*(3), 257-276.

Timms, C., Lankshear, C., Anderson, N., & Courtney, L. (2008). Riding a hydra: Women ICT professionals' perceptions of working in the Australian ICT industry. *Information Technology and People, 21*(2), 156-177.

Table 1. Availability and use of FWAs in the two phases of the survey (N=823)

	Time one				*Time two*			
	Availability		*Use*		*Availability*		*Use*	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*
Flexitime	403	49.0	344	41.8	628	76.3	126	15.3
Part-time work	540	65.6	248	30.1	623	75.7	203	24.7
Compressed work week	137	16.6	115	14.0	464	56.4	70	8.5
Telecommuting	213	26.0	127	15.0	405	49.2	65	8.0
At least one FWA	709	86.1	465	57.0	787	95.6	331	40.0

Table 2. *Means, standard deviations, comparison and effect size of study variables*

	Time 1		*Time 2*			
					Paired samples t test	*Eta-Squared* η^2
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*		
Supervisor Support	3.70	1.32	3.64	1.35	*ns*	
Organisational Support	4.69	1.10	4.61	1.16	*ns*	
Organisational Time Demands	3.15	1.05	3.18	1.09	*ns*	
Negative Career Consequences	3.04	.94	3.06	.98	*ns*	
Turnover Intentions	2.04	1.02	2.08	1.06	*ns*	
Work Engagement	3.25	.88	3.86	.88	21.36***	.12
Anxiety Depression	.75	.66	.82	.69	*ns*	
Use of FWAs	1.00	1.10	.60	.85	-11.68***	.14
Availability of FWAs	1.57	1.10	2.58	1.21	20.64***	.12

Note 1. Probability for paired samples *t* test was set at .006 (Bonferroni adjustment) with a critical value of t=3.09 two tailed; *** p<.001

Table 3. *Correlations and Cronbach's Alphas of study variables.*

		1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*	*14*	*15*
1.	sex	-														
2.	age	-.07	-													
3.	Dep/Mar	.13***	.17***	-												
4.	Use FWAs	.02	-.05	-.25***	-											
5.	Availability of FWAs	.02	-.07*	-.06	.46***	-										
6.	Supervisor Support	.15***	-.05	.03	.03	.02	*.94*									
7.	Org. Support	.08*	-.03	.11**	.03	.00	.44***	*.87*								
8.	Org. Time Demands	-.10***	-.04	-.05	-.05	.01	-.33***	-.55***	*.86*							
9.	NCC	-.08*	-.05	-.14***	.05	.06	-.34***	-.59***	.69***	*.88*						
10.	Turnover Intentions T1	-.11**	-.10**	-.17***	.09**	-.02	-.30***	-.33***	.35***	.36***	*.83*					
11.	Turnover Intentions T2	-.09*	-.06	-.19***	.11***	.01	-.17***	-.26***	.30***	.26***	.53***	*.84*				
12.	Work Engagement T1	.07*	.01	-.23***	.12**	.05	.24***	.20***	-.13***	-.14***	-.27***	-.14***	*.91*			

13.	Work Engagement T2	.15***	.11**	.15***	-.16***	-.06	.21***	.25***	-.20***	-.22***	-.27***	-.38***	.57***	*.91*
14.	Anxiety Depression T1	-.04	-.09*	-.09*	.06	.02	-.20***	-.25***	.23***	.27***	.36***	.24***	-.26***	-.26***	*.81*
15.	Anxiety Depression T2	-.01	-.11**	-.11**	.08*	.09**	-.14***	-.24***	.23***	.24***	.21***	.38***	-.16***	-.39***	.47***	*.80*

Note 1. Cronbach's alphas appear on the diagonal in italics.
Note 2. *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.
Note 3. Dep/Mar = indicates the respondent has dependents *and/or* is married, T1 = Time 1 and T2 = Time 2, Org = Organisational, NCC = Negative Career Consequences

Table 4. *Summary of results for hierarchical regression analyses testing the relationship of study variables in the prediction of turnover intentions, work engagement and anxiety/depression T1 cross-sectional (N = 823)*

		Cross-sectional Analyses (Time 1)											
		Turnover Intentions				*Work Engagement*				*Anxiety-Depression*			
		B	*β*	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	*β*	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	*β*	R^2	ΔR^2
Step				.03	.04***			.05	.06***			.01	.01*
1	Gender	-.19	-.08*			.16	.08*			-.03	-.02		
	age	-.01	-.07*			.00	.05			-.01	-.08*		
	Dep/Mar	-.27	-.13***			-.41	-.24***			-.10	-.07*		
Step				.19	.17***			.12	.07***			.11	.09***
2	Gender	-.08	-.04			.09	.05			.01	.01		
	age	-.01	-.08*			.01	.06			-.01	-.08*		
	Dep/Mar	-.18	-.09**			-.42	-.24***			-.05	-.04		
	Sup Support	-.13	-.17***			.11	.16***			-.04	-.09*		
	Org. Support	-.08	-.09*			.11	.13**			-.07	-.12**		
	Org. Time Dem.	.15	.16**			.01	.01			.03	.05		
	NCC	.12	.11*			-.04	-.04			.09	.13*		
	Use of FWAs	.14	.07*			.06	.06			.07	.05		

Note 1. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Note 2. Dep/Mar = indicates the respondent has dependents *and/or* is married, T1 = Time 1, Org = Organisational, Sup= Supervisor, NCC = Negative Career Consequences

Table 5. *Summary of results for longitudinal hierarchical regression analyses testing the relationship of study variables time 1 in the prediction of turnover intentions, work engagement and anxiety/depression Time 2 longitudinal (N = 823)*

		Turnover Intentions T2				*Work engagement T2*				*Anxiety-Depression T2*			
		B	*β*	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	*β*	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	*β*	R^2	ΔR^2
Step				.29	.29***			.33	.33***			.23	.23***
1	T1 criterion	.56	.54***			.58	.58***			.50	.48***		
Step				.30	.01**			.44	.11***			.24	.01**
2	T1 criterion	.54	.51***			.65	.64***			.66	.46***		
	Gender	-.07	-.03			.15	.07**			.03	.02		
	age	.00	.00			.01	.07*			.00	-.06		
	Dep/Mar	-.23	-.11***			.54	.30***			-.11	-.08*		
Step3				.31	.02**			.47	.03***			.26	.03***
	T1 criterion	.49	.47***			.64	.63***			.60	.42***		
	Gender	-.05	-.02			.14	.07*			.04	.03		
	age	.00	.01			.01	.06*			.00	-.06		
	Dep/Mar	-.19	-.09**			.41	.23***			-.06	-.04		
	Sup Support	.02	.02			.01	.02			.00	.00		
	Org. Support	-.04	-.04			.05	.07			-.05	-.08		

Org Time Dem	.12	.12**	-.04	-.05	.05	.08
NCC	-.03	-.02	.02	.02	.02	.02
Use of FWAs	.05	.06	-. 13	-.17***	.05	.08*

Note 1. Time one equivalent variable is the Time1 equivalent of Time 2 outcome variables (Turnover Intentions, Work Engagement and Anxiety Depression).

Note 2. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Note 3. Dep/Mar = indicates the respondent has dependents *and/or* is married, T1 = Time 1 and T2 = Time 2, Org = Organisational, NCC = Negative Career Consequence